

**REMARKS**

The present application was filed on September 26, 2000 with claims 1 through 19. Claims 1 through 19 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 12-14, and 16 are proposed to be amended and new claims 20-25 are proposed to be added herein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that the Information Disclosure Statement has been entered, but that the information referred to therein has not been considered since the IDS does not include a "concise explanation of the relevance" (of the references). The Examiner acknowledged Applicants' claims for foreign priority under U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and noted that Applicants have not filed certified copies of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b). The Examiner also objected to claims 1 and 16-19 due to indicated informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall et al. (United States Patent Number 6,292,904), and further in view of "Using Paradox 5 for Windows" Special Edition (hereinafter, Paradox), Que, 1994, pp. 133-139 and 526-529, rejected claims 4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall in view of Paradox, and further in view of Atlas et al. (United States Patent Number 5,848,413). The Examiner indicated that claims 8 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

The present invention is directed to providing a predetermined user with a privilege for a delegated application processing without providing the user with the application requester's log-in password. The application requester specifies a form class for identifying a form that requests a delegated application, both starting and ending dates for identifying a term of the requested delegated application together with a proxy applicant user ID that specifies a proxy applicant requested for the delegated application, then registers those items in the electronic form system. The electronic form system then registers those items in a proxy applicant definition table together with the application requester user ID. The proxy applicant can thus enter the form submission mode of the

application requester. In the form submission mode of the application requester, forms that can be submitted by the proxy applicant are selected according to the information of the form class, the starting date, the ending date, etc. registered beforehand and displayed as a list. If the proxy applicant selects one of those forms, the proxy applicant can obtain 5 a blank form of the selected electronic form and such user data as, e.g., the name, the user ID, and the belonging organization, are filled in the blank form automatically. The proxy applicant thus fills other necessary items in the form and applies for the form instead of the application requester.

Information Disclosure Statement

10 The Examiner notes that the Information Disclosure Statement has been entered, but that the information referred to therein has not been considered since the IDS does not include a “concise explanation of the relevance” (of the references).

Applicants will submit an updated Information Disclosure Statement that includes a concise explanation of the relevance of the references in the near future.

15 Priority

The Examiner noted that Applicants have not filed certified copies of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

A certified copy of the Japanese application is submitted herewith.

Formal Objections

20 Claim 1 was objected to because “first electronic forms adapts to coincides” reads better as “first electronic forms coincides.” Claims 16-19 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only, and/or, cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

25 Claims 1 and 16 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion and Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 1 and 16-19 be withdrawn.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, 30 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the current date” in line 11.

Claim 1 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitation “the current date” and Applicants respectfully request that the section 112 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1-3 and 9-14

Independent claims 1-3 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of Paradox. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Broomhall teaches that “the sponsor requests the external user’s id, and password --- *form of requesting a delegated application* --- by inputting personal information, such as name, telephone number, etc. into a form.”

Applicants note that Broomhall is directed to “providing secure user account identifiers and passwords to facilitate *sharing by users of data* between a secure internal server and an external server accessible over the Internet.” (See, Abstract; emphasis added.) While Broomhall discloses *sharing data* by providing a user ID and password to a user, Broomhall does not address the issue of *delegating an application* to a *proxy*. Broomhall also does not disclose or suggest *form condition data*, defined in the present invention as “a concept that includes form ID for *identifying a specific form uniquely* and data for identifying such a predetermined form group as a form class, as well as data for identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional expression in which ‘XXX’ is set as the first three digits and a number of 22 or under is set in the lower two digits of the form ID.” (Page 4, last paragraph.) Independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, as amended, require registering or managing *form condition data* that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated application*. Independent claims 3, 11 and 14 require proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy* applicant who is requested for said *delegated application*. (Applicants note that the Examiner has not asserted that Broomhall discloses *form condition data*.)

Thus, Broomhall does not disclose or suggest registering or managing *form condition data* that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated application*, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, and does not disclose or suggest

---

proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claims 3, 11 and 14.

Additional Cited References

Paradox was also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of allowing the definition of auxiliary information. Applicants note that Paradox does not address the issue of *delegating an application* to a *proxy*. Paradox also does not disclose or suggest *form condition data* as defined in the present invention.

Thus, Paradox does not disclose or suggest registering or managing form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, and does not disclose or suggest proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claims 3, 11 and 14.

Atlas et al. was cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of automatically providing completions of form fields. Applicants note that Atlas does not address the issue of *delegating an application* to a *proxy*. Atlas also does not disclose or suggest *form condition data* as defined in the present invention.

Thus, Atlas et al. do not disclose or suggest registering or managing form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, and do not disclose or suggest proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claims 3, 11 and 14.

New Claims 20-25

New claims 20-25 have been added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim various features of the invention, consistent with the scope of the originally filed specification, in order to give applicant the protection to which he is entitled. No new matter is introduced. Support for this material is set forth at pages 4-5 and 20-35 of the originally filed specification. The Examiner has previously considered the subject matter presented in new claims 20-25 when rejecting, for example, claims 1-8. More specifically, claim 20 requires *form condition data* that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated application*, and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy* applicant who is requested for said *delegated application*.

As noted above, Broomhall is directed to “providing secure user account identifiers and passwords to facilitate *sharing by users of data* between a secure internal server and an external server accessible over the Internet.” (See, Abstract; emphasis added.) While Broomhall discloses *sharing data* by providing a user ID and password to a user, Broomhall does not address the issue of *delegating an application* to a proxy. Broomhall also does not disclose or suggest *form condition data*, defined in the present invention as “a concept that includes form ID for *identifying a specific form uniquely* and data for identifying such a predetermined form group as a form class, as well as data for identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional expression in which ‘XXX’ is set as the first three digits and a number of 22 or under is set in the lower two digits of the form ID.” (Page 4, last paragraph.)

Thus, Broomhall et al., Paradox, and Atlas et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, or proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claim 20.

Allowance of claims 20-25 is believed to be warranted.

Dependent Claims 4-8, 15-19 and 21-25

Dependent claims 5-7 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of Paradox, and claims 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall in view of Paradox, and further in view of Atlas et al.

Claims 4-8, 15-19, and new dependent claims 21-25 are dependent on claims 1-3, 12-14, and new claim 20, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Broomhall et al., Paradox, and Atlas et al. (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1-3, 12-14, and 20 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claims 8 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims  
1-25, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further  
suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to  
5 contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



10 Date: September 14, 2004  
Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
15 Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560